



UNITED NATIONS



THIRD CONFERENCE ON THE LAW OF THE SEA

PROVISIONAL

For participants only

A/CONF.62/C.2/SR.41

20 August 1974

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

Second Session

SECOND COMMITTEE

PROVISIONAL SUMMARY RECORD OF THE FORTY-FIRST MEETING

Held at the Parque Central, Caracas,
on Friday, 16 August 1974, at 10.50 a.m.

Chairman:

Mr. AGUILAR

Venezuela

Rapporteur:

Mr. NANDAN

Fiji

CONTENTS

Consideration of subjects and issues and related items: introduction
of draft proposals

Corrections to this record should be submitted in one of the four working languages (English, French, Russian or Spanish), preferably in the same language as the text to which they refer. Corrections should be sent in quadruplicate within fifteen working days to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, Department of Conference Services, room LX-2332, United Nations, New York N.Y. 10017, USA, and also incorporated in one copy of the record.

AS THIS RECORD WAS DISTRIBUTED ON 20 AUGUST 1974, THE TIME-LIMIT FOR CORRECTIONS WILL BE 10 SEPTEMBER 1974.

The co-operation of participants in strictly observing this time-limit would be greatly appreciated.

C-5437

/...

A/CONF.62/C.2/SR.41

English

Page 2

CONSIDERATION OF SUBJECTS AND ISSUES AND RELATED ITEMS: INTRODUCTION OF DRAFT PROPOSALS (A/CONF.62/C.2/L.26, L.47 and L.57)

The CHAIRMAN observed that, in accordance with the Committee's wishes, the present meeting had been convened in order to give delegations an opportunity to introduce draft proposals.

Mr. OLSZOWKA (Poland) introduced document A/CONF.62/C.2/L.26, which had been sponsored by the delegations of Bulgaria, the German Democratic Republic, the Soviet Union and Poland. The document contained draft articles on the territorial sea and dealt in particular with the nature and characteristics of the territorial sea, its breadth and delimitation, and the right of innocent passage.

Article 1 reaffirmed the sovereignty of coastal States over their territorial sea, and specified that all the resources in the territorial sea were under that sovereignty. It would be noted that, under the draft articles, coastal States exercised their full sovereignty, subject only to recognized restrictions, such as the right of innocent passage. Comparison with the draft articles concerning the economic zone (A/CONF.62/C.2/L.38) submitted by the same sponsors together with the delegations of the Byelorussian SSR and the Ukrainian SSR revealed a distinction between the proposed rights to be granted to the coastal State in the territorial sea, on the one hand, and in the economic zone, on the other. Article 1 of the present proposal followed the pattern of the 1958 Geneva Convention, which could be considered as reflecting general rules of international law.

The sponsors had taken into account the practice of the large majority of States, and accordingly article 2 authorized each State to determine the breadth of its territorial sea within a maximum limit of 12 nautical miles. That breadth, he believed, represented a fair balance between the interests of coastal States and those of the international community.

The sponsors considered that the complex and highly technical problem of measuring the breadth of the territorial sea had been satisfactorily resolved in the 1958 Geneva Convention on the Territorial Sea and the Contiguous Zone. Thus they proposed that articles 3 to 13 of that Convention should be reproduced without any change. The different systems of drawing baselines provided for in that Convention were generally recognized and had been referred to by the General Assembly in the Treaty on the Prohibition of the Emplacement of Nuclear Weapons and Other Weapons of Mass Destruction on the Sea-Bed and the Ocean Floor and in the Subsoil thereof. The sponsors did not,

/...

(Mr. Olszowka, Poland)

however, wish to preclude the possibility of filling certain gaps in the Geneva Convention, particularly in relation to the baselines of oceanic archipelagos.

The main part of document A/CONF.62/C.2/L.26 dealt with the right of innocent passage through the territorial sea. Generally speaking, the draft articles were more elaborate than the provisions of the Geneva Convention on the Territorial Sea and the Contiguous Zone, and the concept of innocent passage and the ways in which it would be translated into practice were defined more precisely. Thus, all the acts which were to be incompatible with the right of innocent passage were specified in article 16, paragraph 2. Furthermore, as in the Geneva Convention, foreign fishing vessels were required to observe the laws and regulations promulgated by coastal States, and submarines were required to navigate on the surface and to show their flag.

Under article 19, the coastal State was authorized to take the necessary steps in its territorial sea to prevent non-innocent passage. Article 20 reaffirmed the right of a coastal State to adopt laws and regulations in respect of innocent passage and, at the same time, stipulated that such laws and regulations must comply with the provisions of the Convention as a whole and other rules of international law. It further specified the different areas in which the coastal State could adopt legislation and regulations.

Generally speaking, the sponsors of the draft articles had been at pains to strike a balance between the interests of the coastal State and those of international navigation. The coastal State was required not to hamper innocent passage or to discriminate between foreign ships and must ensure that any navigational hazards of which it had knowledge were adequately publicized.

Although the sponsors were convinced that the main provisions of the draft articles constituted an equitable and viable solution to the various problems concerning the territorial sea, they were prepared to consider any suggestions or amendments which would improve them and make them more generally acceptable.

Mr. RYAN (Australia) introduced the proposals contained in document A/CONF.62/C.2/L.57. He had asked for the draft article on highly migratory species to be included in the revised working paper as a distinctive trend. The article stressed the need for international and regional co-operation in matters relating to the conservation and management of highly migratory species. The organizations

/...

1/10/70 2/5/81

English

Page 4

(Mr. Ryan, Australia)

envisaged in paragraph 1 would issue regulations governing the conservation and management of any given species with the object of ensuring rational exploitation of the species within its maximum sustainable yield. The regulations could include the establishment of national quotas. The provision contained in paragraph 4A was very important to many coastal States. If a coastal State preferred to build up a short-range fishing fleet to fish for highly migratory species, it should be protected against competition from long-distance fishing fleets that had the advantage of being able to follow the fish wherever they went. That was particularly so in the case of his own country, whose main fishing for highly migratory species took place within the 200-mile limit. Nevertheless, fishing by coastal States must not violate the regulations of the relevant international organization. He commended the draft article to the Conference as an effective means of managing stocks of highly migratory species while protecting the interest of coastal States and of States operating long-distance fishing fleets.

Mr. STEVENSON (United States of America) said that his delegation had presented draft articles on the economic zone and continental shelf (A/CONF.62/C.2/L.47), but had been unable to introduce them at the time of the general debate on the item. He had referred to certain specific proposals in the closed meeting on informal Working Paper No. 3, but there were a number of general points he wished to make.

The proposals contained in the document were intended to replace the draft articles on fisheries and the coastal sea-bed economic area previously submitted in Sub-Committee II of the Sea-Bed Committee, and were presented as a basis for negotiation subject to agreement on other basic questions of the law of the sea.

As far as the general concept of the economic zone was concerned, what was involved was not merely coastal State rights but coastal State jurisdiction. That jurisdiction extended to the renewable and non-renewable resources of the zone, as well as to the rights and duties with respect to the protection of the marine environment and scientific research specified in the convention. It also involved rights of the coastal State in respect of installations used for economic purposes and drilling for any purpose.

An effort had been made to balance the rights of the international community recognized by general international law against those granted the coastal State under

/...

A/CONF 32/C.2/SR.41
English
Page 5

(Mr. Stevenson, United States)

the convention: nevertheless, rights acquired by the coastal State pursuant to the draft articles, as, for example, with respect to fishing, would prevail. In view of the need for balance in harmonizing different interests in an area of ocean space used for various purposes at the same time, the same language of "no unjustifiable interference" had been used to indicate that the exercise of rights of coastal States should not interfere with those of other States and vice versa.

His delegation considered the question of including conflict resolution procedures to be of vital importance in accommodating different uses of the same economic zone.

The draft articles relating to fisheries gave the coastal State not just rights but broad jurisdiction over fisheries conservation and management in the economic zone. The articles indicated clearly that it was the coastal State that determined conservation, subject to certain general principles in the articles. Although generally accepted standards should be taken into account, the coastal State was under no obligation to await recommendations from an international fishery organization or to follow those recommendations.

A coastal State must decide for itself if its resources were being fully used by its nationals. There should be recourse to the dispute settlement machinery only when the validity of the coastal State's conservation measures under the articles or the correctness of the coastal State's assessment of full utilization were questioned, and pending settlement the coastal State measures would remain in force.

It was vital to the preservation of anadromous species to take into account the fact that they returned to the rivers of their birth to spawn. The draft articles would prohibit fishing for anadromous species seaward of the territorial sea except with the consent of the State of origin.

In the articles on highly migratory species an effort had been made to take into account scientific evidence that made it critical to agree on international arrangements for the conservation and management of such species, while recognizing the clear interest of the coastal States in whose economic zone such fish were caught in an equitable share of the benefits. Suitable principles must be developed to give meaningful recognition to that interest. Moreover, the coastal State in whose economic zone highly migratory species were caught by foreign vessels should be entitled to reasonable fees.

/...

A/CONF.62/C.2/SR.41

English

Page 6

(Mr. Stevenson, United States)

The draft articles provided for coastal State sovereign rights over the continental shelf for resource exploitation purposes out to the outer limit of the continental margin, but at the same time, article 27 (b) provided for payments to the international community in respect of exploitation beyond the 200-metre isobath or the seaward limit of the territorial sea, whichever was farther seaward. That was suggested as a way to reconcile the positions of States that maintained that their rights extended to the edge of the continental margin beyond 200 miles and those that did not wish to see the common heritage of mankind diminished by recognizing coastal State jurisdiction beyond 200 miles. Although the principle had not yet been agreed upon, he hoped that Governments would consider it as a possible accommodation.

Article 28 contained provisions ensuring coastal State control over installations for the exploitation of resources and other economic purposes and over installations that might interfere with the resource rights of the coastal State. Unlike the Convention on the Continental Shelf, the new draft articles envisaged the possibility of safety zones extending more than 500 metres around installations in conformity with any applicable international standards. Such larger zones might be necessary in the case of new types of continental shelf installations such as airports and superports.

Mr. TUNCEL (Turkey) said that, according to information recently published by the press, the parliament of a certain country had promulgated a law enabling the Government to authorize enterprises to establish artificial islands up to a distance of 30 miles from its coast. As the representative of the United States had already mentioned, artificial islands and installations included harbours and airports and, in view of the swift rate at which technology was being developed, might soon comprise many other different kinds of installations. That being so, the proposals concerning artificial installations in document A/CONF.62/C.2/L.47 were of extreme interest.

The United States delegation was proposing in article 28 safety zones that would extend to a distance of 500 metres around such installations. That distance was the same as the distance suggested in the Geneva Convention on the Continental Shelf. However, in view of the size of present-day installations, his delegation believed that such a diameter was insufficient and preferred the idea of "reasonable safety zones", which was also contemplated in the United States draft. Indeed, the safety zones around the larger installations designed to service the giant tankers now being built should

/...

A/CONF.62/C.2/SR.41

English

Page 7

(Mr. Tuncel, Turkey)

extend to a distance of at least a few kilometres. Although the United States draft stated that the breadth of the safety zones should conform to applicable international standards to be established by the Inter-Governmental Maritime Consultative Organization, his delegation believed that the Conference had a duty to elucidate the issue first. He therefore hoped that the Committee would give the problem the attention which it deserved.

Another problem which must be resolved was the question of the rights of the coastal State within the safety zone. The United States delegation was of the opinion that the coastal State should take appropriate measures to ensure the safety of the installations and of navigation. His delegation endorsed that approach, since it did not believe that the coastal State should be entitled to exercise within the zone rights similar to those of innocent passage.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the meeting was confined to the introduction of proposals and that any comments of the kind expressed by the representative of Turkey should be made at a later stage.

Mr. ABBADI (Secretary of the Committee) said that the delegation of Sierra Leone had added its name to the list of original sponsors of document A/CONF.62/C.2/L.62, from which it had been inadvertently omitted. The delegations of Bangladesh, Guatemala, Haiti, Indonesia, Guinea and Somalia had become sponsors of document A/CONF.62/C.2/L.42/Rev.1 and the delegations of Cuba and the Libyan Arab Republic had become sponsors of document A/CONF.62/C.2/L.58.

The meeting rose at 11.35 a.m.